

Exhibit 21

From: [Ross MacDonald](#)
To: [Nemelka, Michael N.](#); [SERVICE-EXTERNAL-DMS-MDL](#)
Cc: [Reynolds Team](#)
Subject: In re DMS - Authenticom Meet & Confer
Date: Tuesday, March 12, 2019 7:31:53 PM

Dear Mike,

Thank you for taking the time to meet and confer with us this morning about a handful of outstanding discovery issues. As discussed on the phone, here is a follow-up email outlining our understanding of where the parties stand on all of the issues where there is an outstanding response or update due.

- Archer Platform – We understand that Authenticom is currently undergoing a review of the list of roughly 1,300 documents we provided you that appeared to link to documents stored on Authenticom’s Archer platform, which had not previously been searched or produced in this case. You indicated that some of these links were no longer active and that the documents could not be found, but that Authenticom intended to produce those documents it was able to find after a reasonable search. You also said you would update us on the status of this effort on Friday.
- Gentry Subpoena – Our understanding is that Mr. Gentry has agreed to the compromise laid out in my February 19, 2019 email to produce documents responsive to Requests No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11 that “may be relevant to the claims and defenses asserted in this litigation.” On our call, however, you indicated that Mr. Gentry intended to take a strict view of relevance with respect to Requests 8 and 9. While we discussed what this meant in general terms on the call, you agreed to let us know in writing what relevancy standard Mr. Gentry intended to apply when reviewing and producing documents responsive to Requests 8 and 9. Also, please let us know the approximate timing you would expect for these documents. We would like them produced at least 7 days before his deposition.
- Presidio Technology Partners – On the phone we discussed Presidio Technology’s responses to its document subpoena. For Requests 2, 3, and 5, we asked Presidio to produce any responsive internal communications or communications with third-parties (beyond Authenticom) as those would not “otherwise be available from parties to the litigation.” For Request 6, we asked Presidio Technology to reevaluate its objections, or, in the alternative, let us know whether no responsive documents exist. And finally, for Request No. 9, we agreed to limit it to DMS providers other than Auto/Mate, to the extent any such responsive documents existed. You indicated that you would discuss these proposed compromises with Presidio and let us know if they were agreeable. Also, please let us know the approximate timing you would expect for any production by Presidio Technology. As with Mr. Gentry, we would like responsive documents produced at least 7 days before a deposition of Mr. Lamm.
- Box.com - You indicated that you are still working on locating the Box.com documents listed in Mark Ryan’s March 6, 2019 email. Can you provide an update on your search by the end of this week?

- PCM Log. We are still evaluating the PCM Log example you provided us this morning, which shows a log of a single poll conducted for a single CDK dealer on December 27, 2018. As we stated on the phone, we do not believe this is consistent with our prior requests on this issue. For instance, our first request on this issue, back on November 7, 2018 was for Authenticom to “produce the PCM log(s) showing all instances of Authenticom’s Dealer DMS access for the past seven days.” 11-7-18 MacDonald Ltr. Similarly, on November 21, we similarly asked for a “7-day example of the PCM log.” 11-21-18 MacDonald Ltr. In response, you wrote that Authenticom had been “investigating whether it is possible to create an example of a PCM Log, as Defendants request.” 2018-12-07 Nemelka Ltr. We had assumed that this meant that Authenticom was investigating producing what we had actually requested, which was a *seven-day* example. In subsequent meet and confers you indicated that Authenticom was working on our request. *E.g.*, 2019-1-25 JDP Ltr. (“On our call, you indicated that Authenticom was still working toward production of an exemplar PCM Log.”). Now, after patiently waiting for four months after our initial request, instead of a 7-day example—which is what we understand Authenticom can retain—we have only received a single poll of a single dealer. This is hardly sufficient. We are evaluating whether to move to compel on this issue and will let you know in the coming days.

I believe those were the only issues discussed that required follow-up by one side or the other. Let us know if I misunderstood any of your positions on the call.

Thanks again.

Ross

Ross MacDonald

Gibbs & Bruns LLP

1100 Louisiana Suite 5300 Houston, TX 77002

713.751.5231 direct | 713.650.8805 main | 713.750.0903 fax